

AUG 8 1961

STATINT

Approved For Release 1999/09/17 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000200940030-7

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD SENATE

Preliminary data—Rampart project (upstream site)

1. GENERAL	
Site of dam, river mile	750
Drainage area (square miles)	200,000
Annual runoff (estimated acre-feet):	
Maximum	102,000,000
Minimum	68,000,000
Mean	85,000,000
Mean annual discharge (cubic feet per second)	118,000
2. RESERVOIR	
Pool elevation (feet)	800
Drawdown (feet)	4
Length (miles) (estimated)	400
Maximum width (miles) (established)	80
Storage (acre-feet) (million)	1,252
Area, full pool (acres)	4,045,000
3. DAM	
Type: Concrete gravity	
Elevation, top of dam (feet)	678
Crest (length in feet) (estimated)	3,000
Height (feet, maximum section)	505
4. POWERHOUSE	
Unit bay spacing (feet)	80
Units (number)	17
Turbines (horsepower)	284,000
Generators (kilowatts)	280,000
5. POWER AND ENERGY	
Average head (feet)	440
Prime power (kilowatts)	3,735,000
Installed capacity (kilowatts)	4,700,000
Firm energy kilowatt-hours per year (estimated) (million)	32,730

INSTRUCTION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record a series of articles and editorials in conjunction with the debate involving the directive of the Pentagon with regard to the policy program it has recently enunciated.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Human Events]

BEHIND THE FULBRIGHT MEMORANDUM

(By Allan Ryskind)

The now famous Fulbright memorandum calling for a silencing of outspoken military personnel and an end to instruction of the military by certain civilian groups is one of the most extraordinary documents that the Capital has had to bear witness to in recent times. It is not only filled with "sheer . . . innuendo . . . and unsubstantiated allegations," as Senator J. Strom Thurmond charged from the Senate floor last week. It is a brazen attempt by liberal elements of the New Frontier, the very persons who wax so eloquently about the guarantees of free speech in the first amendment, to muzzle all those who disagree with the liberals' own particular interpretation of how to meet the Communist menace.

One only needs to read the document to see how true this is. The Fulbright memorandum is not basically an attack against so-called "rightwing extremists." Its central targets are, rather, such scholarly and informational groups as the Foreign Policy Research Institute of Pennsylvania, the Institute of American Strategy and the National War College, American Strategy for the Future, Inc., and such noted scholars as Dr. Richard L. Walker.

Perhaps its most central target is a 1958 directive of the National Security Council, the top strategic advisory panel to the President,

which called for making use of military personnel and facilities to arouse the public "to the menace of the cold war."

The Fulbright document scores the National Security Council directive. It declares the policy of using military men to arouse the public is in "basic error." Military personnel, the document charges, do not have the "necessarily broad background which would enable them to relate the various aspects of the cold war effort, one to another." It briefs, suggests the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, an admiral like Arleigh Burke, or a general like Douglas MacArthur is, presumably, less capable of understanding the global menace than an ex-hacker like Chester Bowles or a leftwing Harvard professor like Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.

"Fundamentally," the memorandum continues, "it is believed that the American people have little, if any, need to be alerted to the menace of the cold war." Alerting the people is dangerous doctrine, according to Fulbright, for the "principal problem of leadership will be, if it is not already, to restrain the desire of the people to 'hit the Communists with everything we've got, particularly if there are more Cubas and Laos (sic)'"

What the Senator is really saying is that he does not think the military or other individuals should alert the American people to a doctrine which Fulbright himself opposes. It was the Arkansas Senator, one may recall, who totally opposed our intervention in Cuba and who greatly influenced the President's decision to call off American air support. If President Kennedy had paid more attention to the military and had hit Castro with even a small part of our Air Force, Castro would no longer occupy Cuba and communism would have suffered a severe defeat.

The Fulbright document also lashes out against the implementation of the National Security Council's directive which has resulted in programs for military personnel in which "extremely radical right-wing speakers and/or materials" were allegedly used. Yet the supplements to the memorandum, which "extremely radical rightwing speaker" that Fulbright believes just about anybody is an extreme rightwinger.

The memorandum points out that among those people who spoke before military gatherings were such individuals as Herbert Phillips, an undercover agent for the FBI who is author of the book "I Led Three Lives"; Robert Morris, who was formerly a counsel to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee; and a recognized scholar on China, Prof. Richard L. Walker, who often writes for the New Leader, which bends philosophically toward the New Deal.

What the document omits, however, are the many speakers of liberal persuasion who have spoken before some of these military seminars the memorandum refers to. The Foreign Policy Research Institute and the Institute for American Strategy, both of which come under attack by Fulbright, arranged summer seminars for Reserve officers at the National War College in Washington in both 1959 and 1960. Liberals as well as conservatives were invited as speakers.

Some of the liberals were: Charles "Chip" Bohlen, an adviser to Roosevelt at Yalta, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, Prof. Hans Morgenthau, a regular contributor to the liberal New Republic, and Dean Acheson, Secretary of State under Truman. Fulbright has no objection to these speakers. His point seems to be that all of the speakers should be of this species. No conservatives. The trouble with the FPRI and the IAS apparently is that they thought all varieties of scholarly opinion should be presented to the reserve officers. Yet the memorandum suggests that the National War College should sever relations with the FPRI and the IAS since the relationship may give one

particularly aggressive view a more direct and commanding influence upon military and civilian conceptions of strategy than is desirable.

One of the most curious charges is the memorandum's attack against "American Strategy for the Nuclear Age" which has been published by the Institute for American Strategy. The document charges that this book, "prepared and disseminated by private organizations with close military connections . . . is by no means representative of the President's announced strategy for the nuclear age." One can only say if it is not representative of the President's announced strategy, President Kennedy has been saying something different to Senator Fulbright than to the rest of us.

The contributors, alone, many of them currently advising the President, should refute this miraculous charge. Dr. Henry Kissinger, now an adviser to Kennedy, Dean Acheson, also a Presidential adviser, Hanson W. Baldwin of the New York Times, and Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, the Department of the Army's Chief of Research and Development, are just a few of those who have contributed to this book.

A scant briefing shows the book advocates a buildup of nuclear weapons, conventional weapons, civil defense, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Does the Senator suggest this is contrary to what the President calls for? True, it does not call for recognition of Red China, as Senator Fulbright has suggested in the past, nor does it criticize the President's attitude on Berlin, which Fulbright has done on a national TV program. Yet neither does the book suggest that Senator Fulbright should be silenced for expressing opposition to the President's announced policy.

The crucial point regarding the Fulbright document, besides its misrepresentations, is that it recommends silencing of voices that do not agree with the Fulbright viewpoint. This, by itself, would be no cause for worry if it were not for the fact that the privately prepared memorandum, sent to the White House and the Pentagon in June, largely influenced a Defense Department directive of July 10 which gives the Defense Department broader powers to gag all those who do not conform to the exact whim of those persons in the Pentagon who will enforce the directive. What worries many here on Capitol Hill is that those who do enforce the directive will be sympathetic with the philosophy of J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, from Arkansas.

[From the Nashville Banner, Aug. 4, 1961]
THE NATIONAL SCENE: WHY THE GAG ON ANTI-COMMUNISTS?

(By Frank Van der Linden)

Senator STROM THURMOND is demanding—and may well get—a senatorial investigation of his documented charge that the Kennedy administration is "muzzling" American military officers and stopping their anti-Communist public educational seminars.

The South Carolina Senator has placed in the Congressional Record a document identified by other sources as the "Fulbright memorandum." This was sent privately to President Kennedy and Defense Secretary McNamara by Senator J. William Fulbright, of Arkansas, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman. It "was responsible," THURMOND told the Senate, for the Pentagon's recent complete reversal of policy on anti-Communist indoctrination courses.

The memorandum recommended a change in the National Security Council Directive of 1958, which states the policy of using military personnel to arouse the public to the menace of the cold war. In too many cases, the memorandum charged, "extremely radical rightwing speakers" have tied in "the left with socialism,

STATINTL